

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA

No. 2:24-cv-00172-TLN-KJN
No. 2:24-cv-00173-TLN-KJN
No. 2:24-cv-00174-TLN-KJN
No. 2:24-cv-00175-TLN-KJN
No. 2:24-cv-00177-TLN-KJN
No. 2:24-cv-00178-TLN-KJN
No. 2:24-cv-00180-TLN-KJN
No. 2:24-cv-00187-TLN-KJN
No. 2:24-cv-00189-TLN-KJN
No. 2:24-cv-00190-TLN-KJN

ORDER

Plaintiff Steven Wayne Bonilla is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in the above-captioned civil actions. On November 29, 2018, the Court declared Plaintiff a vexatious litigant and ordered the Clerk of the Court not to file or assign a civil case number to any proposed habeas corpus petition or civil action related to Plaintiff's criminal conviction in Alameda County. (*See Bonilla v. Fresno County*, Case No. 2: 18-cv-2544-TLN-KJN, ECF No.


1 13). On June 14, 2023, the Court modified its vexatious litigant Order and directed the Clerk of
2 the Court to open a new case for each attempted new pleading and assign it to the undersigned for
3 review. (*Id.* at ECF No. 26.) If the Court determines the new filing is related to Plaintiff's
4 Alameda County criminal conviction, the case will be ordered dismissed and closed. (*Id.*)

5 The Court has reviewed the complaints/petitions filed in the above-captioned cases and
6 finds they are related to Plaintiff's Alameda County criminal conviction.¹

7 Accordingly, the complaints/petitions in Case Nos. 2:24-cv-00172, 2:24-cv-00173, 2:24-
8 cv-00174, 2:24-cv-00175, 2:24-cv-00177, 2:24-cv-00178, 2:24-cv-00180, 2:24-cv-00187, 2:24-
9 cv-00189 and 2:24-cv-00190 are hereby DISMISSED. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close
10 these cases. No further filings will be accepted.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: February 09, 2024



13
14
15 _____
16 Troy L. Nunley
17 United States District Judge

25 1 Plaintiff erroneously names the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in the caption of the
26 complaint/petition in Case No. 2:24-cv-00178. To the extent Plaintiff intended to file that
27 complaint/petition in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, the
28 Court finds that the claims raised therein are related to his Alameda County criminal conviction
and are therefore dismissed pursuant to the modified vexatious litigant Order.